The Minimal GUT with Inflaton and Dark Matter Unification

Heng-Yu Chen[1], Ilia Gogoladze[1], Shan Hu[2], Tianjun Li[3,4], and Lina Wu[3,5]
[1]*Bartol Research Institute, Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Delaware, Newark, DE 19716, USA*
[2]*Department of Physics and Electronic Technology, Hubei University, Wuhan 430062, P. R. China*
[3]*Key Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Institute of Theoretical Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China*
[4]*School of Physical Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, No. 19A Yuquan Road, Beijing 100049, China and*
[5]*School of Physical Electronics, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu 610054, P. R. China*

Giving up the solutions to the fine-tuning problems, we propose the non-supersymmetric flipped $SU(5) \times U(1)_X$ model based on the minimal particle content principle, which can be constructed from the four-dimensional $SO(10)$ models, five-dimensional orbifold $SO(10)$ models, and local F-theory $SO(10)$ models. To achieve gauge coupling unification, we introduce one pair of vector-like fermions, which form complete $SU(5) \times U(1)_X$ representation. Proton lifetime is around 5×10^{35} years, neutrino masses and mixing can be explained via seesaw mechanism, baryon asymmetry can be generated via leptogenesis, and vacuum stability problem can be solved as well. In particular, we propose that inflaton and dark matter particle can be unified to a real scalar field with Z_2 symmetry, which is not an axion and does not have the non-minimal coupling to gravity. Such kind of scenarios can be applied to the generic scalar dark matter models. Also, we find that the vector-like particle corrections to the B_s^0 masses can be about 6.6%, while their corrections to the K^0 and B_d^0 masses are negligible.

arXiv:1703.07542v1 [hep-ph] 22 Mar 2017

Introduction – It is well-known that a Standard Model (SM) like Higgs boson (h) with mass $m_h = 125.09 \pm 0.24$ GeV was discovered at the LHC [1–3], and thus the SM particle content has been confirmed. Moreover, there are many possible directions for new physics beyond the SM: supersymmetry, extra dimensions, strong dynamics or say composite Higgs field, extra gauge symmetries, and Grand Unified Theory (GUT), etc. However, we do not have any new physics signal at the 13 TeV Large Hadron Collider (LHC) yet. Therefore, we may need to reconsider the principle for new physics beyond the SM, and then propose the promising models.

First, let us briefly review the convincing evidence for new physics beyond the SM:

• Dark Matter (DM) is a necessary ingredient of cosmology, considering the cosmic microwave background (CMB) or the rotation curves of spiral galaxies, etc [4, 5].

• Dark Energy (DE) is required due to the concordance of data from cosmic microwave anisotropy [4], galaxy clusters (see, *e.g.*, [6]), and high-redshift Type-IA supernovae [7, 8].

• The nonzero masses and mixing of neutrinos from the atmospheric [9] and solar neutrino experiments [10], as well as the reactor anti-neutrino experiments [11], etc.

• A larger fraction of baryonic matter compare to anti-matter in the Universe, *i.e.*, the cosmic baryon asymmetry $\eta = n_B/n_\gamma = 6.05 \pm 0.07 \times 10^{-10}$ [5].

• The nearly scale-invariant, adiabatic, statistically isotropic, and Gaussian density fluctuations (see, *e.g.*, [12]) point to cosmic inflation, which can solve the horizon and flatness problems of the Universe as well.

Second, there are two kinds of theoretical problems in the SM: fine-tuning problems and aesthetical problems. The fine-tuning problems are: (i) The cosmological constant problem: why the cosmological constant is so tiny? (ii) The gauge hierarchy problem: the SM Higgs boson mass square is not stable against quantum corrections and has quadratic divergences, while the electroweak scale is about 16 order smaller than the reduced Planck scale $M_{\rm Pl} \simeq 2.43 \times 10^{18}$ GeV; (iii) The strong CP problem: the θ parameter of the Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD) is smaller than 10^{-10} from the measurements of the neutron electric dipole moment [13, 14]; (iv) The SM fermion mass hierarchy problem: electron mass is about 5 order smaller than top quark mass. Also, the aesthetic problems are: (i) No explanation for the structure of gauge interactions; (ii) No explanation of fermion mass structures; (iii) No explanation for charge quantization; (iv) No realization of gauge coupling unification. The aesthetic problems can be solved in the Grand Unified Theories (GUTs) if we can realize gauge coupling unification. In addition, the SM Higgs quartic coupling becomes negative around 10^9 GeV for central measured values of the SM parameters. Which means that the SM Higgs vacuum is not stable, which is called stability problem [15, 16]. Interestingly, the measured Higgs mass roughly corresponds to the minimal values of the Higgs quartic and top Yukawa coupling as well as the maximal values of the SM gauge couplings allowed by vacuum meta-stability [17]. In short, the SM vacuum can be meta-stable while not absolutely stable.

Neglecting the fine-tuning and aesthetic problems, Davoudiasl, Kitano, Li and Murayama proposed the New Minimal Standard Model (NMSM) to address the above new physics evidence based on the principle of the minimal particle content and most general renormalizable Lagrangian [18]. The dark energy is explained by a tiny cosmological constant, dark matter particle is a real scalar with Z_2 symmetry, inflaton is another real scalar, neutrino masses and mixing can be addressed via seesaw mechanism [19], and baryon asymmetry is generated via leptogenesis [20]. Interestingly, inflation is still consistent with current observations if we consider the polynomial inflation [21], and the NMSM is still fine via meta-stability due to the minimality principle. Later,

Asaka, Blanchet and Shaposhnikov proposed the νMSM to explain baryon asymmetry, neutrino oscillations, and dark matter via sterile right-handed neutrinos with masses around a few keV [22, 23]. In 2015, Salvio proposed a simple SM completion [24]. Compared to the NMSM, the main differences are: (i) The dark matter candidate is axion, and the strong CP problem is solved via the invisible axion model proposed by Kim, Shifman, Vainshtein, and Zakharov (KSVZ) [25]; (ii) Higgs field as the inflaton. On the other hand, the string landscape can explain the cosmological constant problem and gauge hierarchy problem [26, 27], but cannot explain the strong CP problem [28]. However, for the non-supersymmetric KSVZ model, at least it is not clear whether the string landscape can stabilize the axion. This is the reason why Barger, Chiang, Jiang and Li proposed the intermediate-scale supersymmetric KSVZ axion model [29]. Also, there exists a serious difficulty for Higgs inflation, for details, see Refs. [30, 31] and references therein. Recently, Ballesteros, Redondo, Ringwald and Tamarit proposed the SM Axion Seesaw Higgs portal inflation (SMASH) model [30, 31] to explain the above new physics evidence and strong CP problem, where the axion is dark matter candidate, as in Ref. [24].

In this paper, we will still neglect the fine-tuning problems, and study the Minimal GUT which can solve all the aesthetic problems in the SM. We propose the non-supersymmetric flipped $SU(5)\times U(1)_X$ models [32–34]. This kind of models can be constructed in the four-dimensional $SO(10)$ models [35], five-dimensional orbifold $SO(10)$ models [36], and local F-theory $SO(10)$ models [37, 38]. To achieve gauge coupling unification, we introduce one pair of vector-like fermions, which form complete $SU(5)\times U(1)_X$ representation. The doublet-triplet splitting problem can be solved at tree level, proton lifetime is about 5×10^{35} years, neutrino masses and mixing can be explained via seesaw mechanism, baryon asymmetry can be generated via leptogenesis, and stability problem can be solved as well. Especially, we for the first time show that inflaton and dark matter particle can be unified to a real scalar field with Z_2 symmetry, unlike all the previous models where such scalar is either an axion or has non-minimal coupling to gravity (Ricci scalar R) [24, 30, 31, 39–41]. In other words, this is a brand new unification of the inflaton and dark matter particle. After inflation, the interaction between inflaton and Higgs field is reduced to that in the NMSM. Thus, such kind of scenarios can be applied to the general scalar dark matter models. Furthermore, we find that the corrections to the B_s^0 masses from vector-like particles can be about 6.6%, while their corrections to the K^0 and B_d^0 masses are negligible.

Model Building – We introduce three families of the SM fermions, two Higgs fields H and h, and one pair of vector-like particles (F_x, $\overline{F}_x$), whose quantum numbers under the $SU(5)\times U(1)_X$ gauge group and SM particle contents are

$$\begin{aligned}&F_i/\Phi/F_x=(\mathbf{10},\mathbf{1}),\ \bar{f}_i=(\bar{\mathbf{5}},-\mathbf{3}),\ \bar{l}_i=(\mathbf{1},\mathbf{5}),\\&\phi=(\mathbf{5},-\mathbf{2}),\ \overline{F_x}=(\overline{\mathbf{10}},\mathbf{1}).\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&F_i=(Q_i,D_i^c,N_i^c),\ \overline{f}_i=(U_i^c,L_i),\ \bar{l}_i=E_i^c,\\&\Phi=(Q_\Phi,D_\Phi^c,N_\Phi^c),\ \phi=(D_\phi,H),\\&F_x=(Q_x,D_x^c,N_x^c),\ \overline{F}_x=(Q_x^c,D_x,N_x)\ ,\end{aligned}\tag{1}$$

where $i=1,2,3$, and Q_i, L_i, U_i^c, D_i^c, L_i, E_i^c, N_i^c, and H are the left-handed quark and lepton doublets, right-handed up-type quarks, down-type quarks, charged leptons, neutrinos, and Higgs field, respectively.

To break the $SU(5)\times U(1)_X$ gauge symmetry down to the SM gauge symmetry, we introduce the following Higgs potential at the GUT scale

$$V_{\rm GUT}=\lambda_\Phi(|\Phi|^2-v_{\rm GUT}^2)^2+\lambda|\Phi\,\phi_m|^2\ ,\tag{2}$$

After minimizing the potential the Φ field develop vacuum expectation value (VEV) at $<N_\Phi^c>=v_{\rm GUT}$ component and $SU(5)\times U(1)_X$ gauge symmetry is broken to the SM gauge symmetry. As the result Q_ϕ and imaginary component of N_Φ^c are eaten by superheavy gauge bosons, while D_Φ^c and real component of N_Φ^c acquire GUT-scale masses. The last tern in Eq. (2) will generate GUT-scale mass to D_ϕ but not the SM higgs doublets, H. Thus, we naturally obtain the doublet-triplet splitting at tree level, but we do need fine-tuning to keep the doublet light due to quantum corrections.

The Yukawa coupling and vector-like mass terms are

$$\begin{aligned}-\mathcal{L}=&M_V F_x\overline{F}_x+\mu_i F_i\overline{F}_x+y_{ij}^D F_iF_j\phi+y_{ij}^{U\nu}F_i\overline{f}_j\overline{\phi}\\&+y_{ij}^E\bar{l}_i\overline{f}_j\phi+y_x^D F_xF_x\phi+y_{xi}^D F_xF_i\phi+y_{xi}^{U\nu}F_x\overline{f}_i\overline{\phi}\\&+y_{ij}^N\frac{1}{M_{\rm Pl}}\overline{\Phi}\,\overline{\Phi}F_iF_j+y_x^N\frac{1}{M_{\rm Pl}}\overline{\Phi}\,\overline{\Phi}F_xF_x\\&+y_{xi}^N\frac{1}{M_{\rm Pl}}\overline{\Phi}\,\overline{\Phi}F_xF_i+y_x^{\overline{N}}\frac{1}{M_{\rm Pl}}\Phi\Phi\overline{F}_x\overline{F}_x+\text{H.C.}\ ,\end{aligned}\tag{3}$$

once Φ field develop VEV the N_i^c, N_x^c, and N_x can obtain around 10^{14} GeV or so mass. Assuming $M_V\approx\mu_i\approx 1TeV$ we can have at low energy $(Q_x+Q_x^c)$ and $(D_x+D_x^c)$ vector like particle at low scale without involving any fine tuning. As shown previously this particle content leads to the gauge coupling unification [42, 43].

Gauge Coupling Unification – We study the gauge coupling unification by taking $M_V=1$ TeV and $\mu_i=0$ in Eq. (4) and using two-loop Renormalization Group Equation (RGE). The result is given in Fig. 1. Defining the gauge coupling unification condition as $\alpha_{\rm GUT}^{-1}\equiv\alpha_1^{-1}=(\alpha_2^{-1}+\alpha_3^{-1})/2$, we obtain $\alpha_{\rm GUT}^{-1}=35.7$ and the GUT scale $M_{\rm GUT}=2.2\times 10^{16}$ GeV. The difference between $\alpha_{\rm GUT}^{-1}$ and $\alpha_2^{-1}/\alpha_3^{-1}$ is about 1.0% or so. With the approximation formulae in Ref. [44], we obtain the proton lifetime for the decay channel $p\to e^+\pi^0$ via heavy gauge boson exchanges around 5×10^{35} years.

Dark Energy – Similar to the NMSM, we simply postulate a cosmological constant of the observed size

$$\mathcal{L}_\Lambda=(2.3\times 10^{-3}\ \text{eV})^4.\tag{4}$$

Neutrino Masses and Mixing and Baryon Asymmetry – The neutrino masses and mixing can be explained via seesaw



FIG. 1. Two-loop gauge coupling evaluation.



FIG. 2. The two-loop RGE evaluation for the Higgs quartic couplings. The dashed lines stand for the Higgs quartic couplings in our model with the central value and one sigma deviations of top quark mass. The black solid line corresponds to the SM case with $m_t = 173.34$ GeV.

mechanism [19] since the right-handed neutrinos (and N_x^c) are very heavy from Eq. (4). Also, the baryon asymmetry can be explained via thermal leptogenesis [20]. The right-handed neutrinos are in the thermal equilibrium in the early Universe, and the lepton asymmetry is generated from the CP violating decays of the lightest right-handed neutrino when it is out of thermal equilibrium. The nonperturbative sphaleron interactions violate $B + L$ but preserve $B - L$, and then the baryon asymmetry is generated from the lepton asymmetry.

Stability Problem – We study the two-loop RGE running of the Higgs quartic coupling. Because it is very sensitive to the top quark mass, we consider the central value $m_t = 173.34$ GeV and one σ deviations of top quark mass [45]. The numerical results are given in Fig. 2. For comparison, we also present that in the SM by taking central value of top quark mass. Thus, to evade the stability problem, we predict the top quark mass to be smaller than its one sigma upper bound $m_t = 174.1$ GeV.

Dark Matter and Inflation – To unify the dark matter particle and inflaton, we introduce a real scalar S with a Z_2 symmetry so that it is stable. The potential for S and ϕ is



FIG. 3. n_s versus r plots compared with Planck 2015 results [47] for TT, TE, EE + lowP, at the 95% CL and 68% CL.

$$V = \lambda_\phi(|\phi|^2 - v^2)^2 + \frac{1}{2}m_S^2 S^2 + \frac{k}{2}|\phi|^2 S^2 + V_I(S),$$
$$V_I(S) = A\,\tanh^4(S/f)\,, \tag{5}$$

where m_S is around the electroweak scale. Thus, the inflaton potential is given by $V_I(S)$, which is the α-attractor model [46]. In terms of the well-known slow-roll parameters

$$\epsilon = \frac{\mathrm{M_{Pl}^2}}{2}\left(\frac{V_I'}{V_I}\right)^2\,,\ \eta = \mathrm{M_{Pl}^2}\left(\frac{\mathrm{V_I''}}{\mathrm{V_I}}\right)\,,\ \zeta = \mathrm{M_{Pl}^4}\left(\frac{\mathrm{V_I'V_I'''}}{\mathrm{V_I^2}}\right)\,,$$

where $X' \equiv dX/dS$, the scalar spectral index, tensor-to-scalar ratio, running of the scalar spectral index, and power spectrum are respectively

$$n_s = 1 - 6\epsilon + 2\eta\,,\ r\ =\ 16\epsilon\,,$$
$$\alpha_s\ =\ \frac{\mathrm{d}n_s}{\mathrm{d}\ln k} = -24\epsilon^2 + 16\epsilon\eta - 2\zeta\,,\ P_s\ =\ \frac{V}{24\pi^2\epsilon}\,. \tag{6}$$

From the Planck, Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (BAO), and BICEP2/Keck Array data [47, 48], we have

$$n_s = 0.968 \pm 0.006\,,\ r = 0.028^{+0.026}_{-0.025}\,,$$
$$\alpha_s = -0.003 \pm 0.007\,,\ P_s = 2.20 \times 10^{-9}\,. \tag{7}$$

In Fig. 3, we present the numerical results for r versus n_s, where the inner and outer circles are 1σ and 2σ boundaries, respectively, from the Planck 2015 results [47] for TT, TE, EE + lowP. Therefore, our model can be highly consistent with the experimental data. Because f is the only parameter which determines the inflationary observable n_s, r, and α_s, we present the slow-roll parameters ϵ, η, and ξ versus f in Fig. 4. Inflation ends when any slow-roll parameter violates the slow-roll condition. When $f \leq 1$ and $f \geq 3.3$, η violates the slow-roll condition $|\eta| < 1$. When $1 < f \leq 3.0$, ζ violates the slow-roll condition $|\zeta| < 1$. And when $3.0 < f \leq 3.2$, ϵ violates the slow-roll condition $\epsilon < 1$.

To have (n_s, r) within the 1σ and 2σ regions of the Planck 2015 results for TT,TE,EE+ lowP in Fig. 3, we obtain that



FIG. 4. The slow-roll parameters ϵ, η, and ξ versus f.

f should lie in the ranges $0 < f \leq 13.4$ for $N = 60$ and $0 < f \leq 7.3$ for $N = 50$, and in the ranges $0 < f \leq 18.8$ for $N = 60$ and $0 < f \leq 11.2$ for $N = 50$, respectively. The numerical values of α_s are always very small at the order of 10^{-4}. Also, the minimum of inflaton potential $V_I(S)$ is at $\phi = 0$, and interestingly, the inflaton potential will not give any mass to S due to $(d^2V_I(S)/dS^2)^{1/2}|_{S=0} = 0$. Thus, after inflation, S become a dark matter particle, and its Lagrangian is reduced to that of the NMSM since $V_I(S)$ is negligible at low energy. Therefore, S can be a viable dark matter candidate. Let us give a benchmark point with $f = 10.0$. We obtain $n_s = 0.964592$, $r = 0.0442495$, $\alpha_s = -0.0006154$ and $N = 60$ for the initial value $S_i = 15.3542\ M_{\rm Pl}$ and final value $S_e = 3.13524\ M_{\rm Pl}$ at the slow-roll condition violation, which fit the experimental data very well. Also, $A = 2.08924 \times 10^{-9}\ M_{\rm Pl}^4$ can be determined from $P_s = 2.20 \times 10^{-9}$. We expand $V_I(S)$ at $S = 0$, and get

$$V_I(S) = 2.0892 \times 10^{-13} S^4 - 2.7856 \times 10^{-15} \frac{S^6}{M_{\rm Pl}^2}$$
$$+2.5071 \times 10^{-17} \frac{S^8}{M_{\rm Pl}^4} - 1.8748 \times 10^{-19} \frac{S^{10}}{M_{\rm Pl}^6} + O\left(S^{12}\right).$$

Therefore, $V_I(S)$ can indeed be neglected at low energy.

Neutral Meson Mixing – We would like to demonstrate that the corrections to the neutral meson (B^0, K^0) mixing in our model satisfy the strict experimental constraints on the flavour changing neutral current processes. Here, we assume the mass of vector-like fermions is 1 TeV. The neutral meson mixing, like $B_d^0 - \overline{B}_d^0$ and $B_s^0 - \overline{B}_s^0$, are dominated by the box diagram in which top quark and vector-like up-type quark running in the loop. In our model, the correct values of the SM quark masses and CKM mixing can be generated through the mixtures of vector-like quarks with SM quarks. We assume that all the elements in up-type and down-type quark mass matrices are zero except the top quark mass. We can use bi-unitary transformation to diagonalize the mass matrices in up-type and down-type sectors, and define a general 5×5 non-unitary CKM matrix, following the approach in Ref. [49]. Here, we present one of realistic moduli examples of 5×5 non-unitary CKM matrix (V_{ab}) obtained in our model (see Eq.(4))

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0.9741 & 0.2254 & 0.004109 & 1.42 \cdot 10^{-5} & 1.22 \cdot 10^{-5} \\ 0.2215 & 0.995 & 0.040414 & 2.34 \cdot 10^{-4} & 1.87 \cdot 10^{-4} \\ 0.008177 & 0.04004 & 1.009 & 0.01226 & 0.00981 \\ 2.6 \cdot 10^{-6} & 0.00132 & 0.380141 & 2.2 \cdot 10^{-6} & 1.1 \cdot 10^{-5} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We define $\lambda^a_{qq'} \equiv V^*_{aq'} V_{aq}$ for mesons with down quarks. The correction to the mixing $(M_{12})_{qq'}$ is the 12 element of 2×2 mass matrix in the neutral meson oscillation system which is related to the mass difference. qq' stands for quarks participating in the box diagram leading to the neutral meson mixing [49]

$$\frac{(M_{12})_{qq'}}{\left(M_{12}^{SM}\right)_{qq'}} \sim 1 + \left(\frac{\lambda^U_{qq'}}{\lambda^t_{qq'}}\right)^2 \frac{S\left(x_U\right)}{S\left(x_t\right)} + 2\frac{\lambda^U_{qq'}}{\lambda^t_{qq'}} \frac{S\left(x_U,\, x_t\right)}{S\left(x_t\right)},$$

where $S\left(x_t\right)$ and $S\left(x_U,\, x_t\right)$ are the IL functions defined as in Ref. [50], $x_t = \left(m_t/M_W\right)^2$, and $x_U = \left(m_U/M_W\right)^2$. Following their convention, the corrections with respect to the SM predictions are defined as $\Delta\left(P_0\right) \equiv \left|\left(M_{12}/M_{12}^{SM}\right)_{P_0}\right| - 1$, where P_0 could be K^0, B_d^0 and B_s^0. Using the 5×5 CKM matrix shown above, we can obtain the corrections with respect to the SM predictions in our model $\left(\Delta\left(K^0\right), \Delta\left(B_d^0\right), \Delta\left(B_s^0\right)\right) = \left(5.5 \cdot 10^{-5},\, 6.3 \cdot 10^{-4},\, 0.066\right)$. Thus, the corrections to ΔM_{K^0} and $\Delta M_{B_d^0}$ are very small compared with the SM predictions. However, the correction to $\Delta M_{B_s^0}$ in our model is 6.6% which cannot be neglected.

Summary – We have proposed the non-supersymmetric minimal GUT with flipped $SU(5) \times U(1)_X$ gauge symmetry and one-pair of vector-like particles, which can incorporate all the convincing new physics beyond the SM based on the principle of the minimal particle content. The gauge coupling unification can be realized, proton lifetime is about 5×10^{35} years, and the doublet-triplet splitting problem at tree level as well as stability problem can be solved. Remarkably, we propose a brand new scenario for the unification of inflaton and dark matter particle, which can be applied to the generic scalar dark matter models. The possible signals from neutral meson mixing have been studied as well. And the detailed study will be given elsewhere [51].

Acknowledgments – This research was supported in part by the Projects 11605049, 11475238 and 11647601 supported by National Science Foundation of China, and by Key Research Program of Frontier Sciences, CAS. The work of IG is supported in part by Bartol Research Institute.

[1] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **716**, 1 (2012) [arXiv:1207.7214 [hep-ex]].

[2] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **716**, 30 (2012) [arXiv:1207.7235 [hep-ex]].

[3] https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/AtlasPublic/HiggsPublicResults; https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/CMSPublic/PhysicsResultsHIG.

[4] D. N. Spergel *et al.*, Astrophys. J. Suppl. **148**, 175 (2003).

[5] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], Astron. Astrophys. **594**, A13 (2016) [arXiv:1502.01589 [astro-ph.CO]].

[6] L. Verde *et al.*, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **335**, 432 (2002).

[7] S. Perlmutter *et al.*, Astrophys. J. **517**, 565 (1999).

[8] A. G. Riess *et al.*, Astron. J. **116**, 1009 (1998).

[9] Y. Fukuda *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 1562 (1998).

[10] S. N. Ahmed *et al.*, arXiv:nucl-ex/0309004.

[11] K. Eguchi *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 071301 (2004).

[12] E. Komatsu *et al.*, Astrophys. J. Suppl. **148**, 119 (2003).

[13] J. M. Pendlebury *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 9, 092003 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.092003 [arXiv:1509.04411 [hep-ex]].

[14] P. Schmidt-Wellenburg, arXiv:1607.06609 [hep-ex].

[15] G. Degrassi, S. Di Vita, J. Elias-Miro, J. R. Espinosa, G. F. Giudice, G. Isidori and A. Strumia, JHEP **1208**, 098 (2012) [arXiv:1205.6497 [hep-ph]].

[16] Y. Tang, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **28**, 1330002 (2013) [arXiv:1301.5812 [hep-ph]].

[17] D. Buttazzo, G. Degrassi, P. P. Giardino, G. F. Giudice, F. Sala, A. Salvio and A. Strumia, JHEP **1312**, 089 (2013) [arXiv:1307.3536 [hep-ph]].

[18] H. Davoudiasl, R. Kitano, T. Li and H. Murayama, Phys. Lett. B **609**, 117 (2005) [hep-ph/0405097].

[19] P. Minkowski, Phys. Lett. **67B**, 421 (1977); M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond, and R. Slansky, in *Supergravity*, ed. F. van Nieuwenhuizen and D. Freedman, (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1979) p. 315; T. Yanagida, *Proc. of the Workshop on Unified Theory and the Baryon Number of the Universe*, KEK, Japan, 1979; S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **43**, 1566 (1979); R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanovic, Phys. Rev. Lett. **44**, 912 (1980).

[20] M. Fukugita and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B **174**, 45 (1986);

[21] T. Li, Z. Sun, C. Tian and L. Wu, Eur. Phys. J. C **75**, no. 7, 301 (2015) [arXiv:1407.8063 [hep-ph]].

[22] T. Asaka, S. Blanchet and M. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. B **631**, 151 (2005) [hep-ph/0503065].

[23] T. Asaka and M. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. B **620**, 17 (2005) [hep-ph/0505013].

[24] A. Salvio, Phys. Lett. B **743**, 428 (2015) [arXiv:1501.03781 [hep-ph]].

[25] J. E. Kim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **43** (1979) 103; M. Shifman, A. Vainshtein, V. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. **B166** (1980) 493.

[26] R. Bousso and J. Polchinski, JHEP **0006**, 006 (2000) [arXiv:hep-th/0004134]; S. Kachru, R. Kallosh, A. Linde and S. P. Trivedi, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 046005 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0301240]; L. Susskind, In *Carr, Bernard (ed.): Universe or multiverse?* 247-266 [hep-th/0302219]; M. R. Douglas, JHEP **0305**, 046 (2003) [hep-th/0303194]; F. Denef and M. R. Douglas, JHEP **0405**, 072 (2004) [hep-th/0404116].

[27] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59** (1987) 2607.

[28] J. F. Donoghue, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 106012 (2004) [Erratum-ibid. D **69**, 129901 (2004)] [arXiv:hep-th/0310203].

[29] V. Barger, C. W. Chiang, J. Jiang and T. Li, Nucl. Phys. B **705**, 71 (2005) [hep-ph/0410252].

[30] G. Ballesteros, J. Redondo, A. Ringwald and C. Tamarit, Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, no. 7, 071802 (2017) [arXiv:1608.05414 [hep-ph]].

[31] G. Ballesteros, J. Redondo, A. Ringwald and C. Tamarit, arXiv:1610.01639 [hep-ph].

[32] S. M. Barr, Phys. Lett. B **112**, 219 (1982).

[33] J. P. Derendinger, J. E. Kim and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B **139**, 170 (1984).

[34] I. Antoniadis, J. R. Ellis, J. S. Hagelin and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B **194**, 231 (1987).

[35] C. S. Huang, T. Li, C. Liu, J. P. Shock, F. Wu and Y. L. Wu, JHEP **0610**, 035 (2006) [hep-ph/0606087].

[36] S. M. Barr and I. Dorsner, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 065013 (2002) [hep-ph/0205088].

[37] J. Jiang, T. Li, D. V. Nanopoulos and D. Xie, Phys. Lett. B **677**, 322 (2009) [arXiv:0811.2807 [hep-th]].

[38] J. Jiang, T. Li, D. V. Nanopoulos and D. Xie, Nucl. Phys. B **830**, 195 (2010) [arXiv:0905.3394 [hep-th]].

[39] A. G. Dias, A. C. B. Machado, C. C. Nishi, A. Ringwald and P. Vaudrevange, JHEP **1406**, 037 (2014) [arXiv:1403.5760 [hep-ph]].

[40] T. Tenkanen, JHEP **1609**, 049 (2016) [arXiv:1607.01379 [hep-ph]].

[41] R. Daido, F. Takahashi and W. Yin, arXiv:1702.03284 [hep-ph].

[42] U. Amaldi, W. de Boer, P. H. Frampton, H. Furstenau and J. T. Liu, Phys. Lett. B **281**, 374 (1992); J. L. Chkareuli, I. G. Gogoladze and A. B. Kobakhidze, Phys. Lett. B **340** (1994) 63; J. L. Chkareuli, I. G. Gogoladze and A. B. Kobakhidze, Phys. Lett. B **376**, 111 (1996); D. Choudhury, T. M. P. Tait and C. E. M. Wagner, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 053002 (2002); D. E. Morrissey and C. E. M. Wagner, Phys. Rev. D **69**, 053001 (2004).

[43] I. Gogoladze, B. He and Q. Shafi, Phys. Lett. B **690**, 495 (2010) [arXiv:1004.4217 [hep-ph]].

[44] B. Dutta, Y. Gao, T. Ghosh, I. Gogoladze, T. Li, Q. Shafi and J. W. Walker, arXiv:1601.00866 [hep-ph].

[45] [ATLAS and CDF and CMS and D0 Collaborations], arXiv:1403.4427 [hep-ex].

[46] R. Kallosh, A. Linde and D. Roest, JHEP **1311**, 198 (2013) [arXiv:1311.0472 [hep-th]].

[47] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], Astron. Astrophys. **594**, A20 (2016) [arXiv:1502.02114 [astro-ph.CO]].

[48] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [BICEP2 and Keck Array Collaborations], Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 031302 (2016) [arXiv:1510.09217 [astro-ph.CO]].

[49] F. J. Botella, G. C. Branco, M. Nebot, M. N. Rebelo and J. I. Silva-Marcos, arXiv:1610.03018 [hep-ph].

[50] G. C. Branco, L. Lavoura and J. P. Silva, "CP Violation," Int. Ser. Monogr. Phys. 103 Oxford University Press (1999).

[51] H.-Y. Chen, I. Gogoladze, S. Hu, T. Li, and L. Wu, in preparation.